DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 129 826 SP 010 543

AUTHOR Zeigler, Earle F.
TITLE A Metaethical Analysis of "Work" and "Play" as Related to North American Sport.
PUB DATE Oct 76
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Philosophic Society for the Study of Sport (6th, Hartford, Connecticut, October 21-23, 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Athletics; Educational History; *Educational Philosophy; *Ethics; Leisure Time; *Physical Education; Recreation; *Semantics; Social Change; *Social Values; Socioeconomic Influences

ABSTRACT

The main consideration involves several subproblems. (1) The fundamental terms (work, play, freedom, constraint, amateur, professional, sport, athletics) are generally used in a sharply dichotomized way. However, they can, and perhaps should, be understood as part of a definitional continuum. (2) The status of sport and athleitcs in education is faced with the problem of so-called amateur, semiprofessional, and professional sport--defined in terms of money rather than, as it should be, as a logical progression of proficiency. (3) This problem of status is related to society as a whole. The concept of work is exalted and play is viewed as frivolous refreshment from worthwhile toil. Thus it is not difficult to understand how the dichotomy of work - play has arisen. (4) Our language downgrades that which we seek in the "good life" --work is viewed as superior to play, whereas actually they are equal and overlapping. Modifying our concepts of work, play, amateur, and professional would probably have a positive influence on the pattern of North American sport and athletics. A final conclusion is justifiable: the concepts of work and play should be modified so that a continuum is recognized between them and the concept of "art" is established as a middle ground. So also with the terms, amateur, professional, and semiprofessional. Identifying the language ailment will help with treatment and cure. A bibliography of 45 documents for further reading is included. (MB)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED129826

A METAETHICAL ANALYSIS OF 'WORK' AND 'PLAY' AS RELATED TO NORTH AMERICAN SPORT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Earle F. Zeigler
The University of Western Ontario
London, Canada

Introduction*

The main problem of this paper is to analyze critically - from a so-called metaethical standpoint - the concepts of 'work' and 'play' and to relate such distinctions to the current scene in sport and/or athletics as we know them typically in North America. It was during my early college days about forty years ago that I realized the amount of confusion in people's minds about the uses of these two everyday terms. Or perhaps it would be more accurate to say that I sensed the presence of confusion when the topic was discussed in more than a superficial manner. But I suppose for the large majority of people there really was no problem at all: work was what you did in life to earn a living or to take care of your basic needs; thus, both my grandparents and parents viewed it as a serious matter, and a significant amount of such arduous endeavor was included as part of my normal upbringing. Play, conversely, was what you were free to do after you had carried out your work responsibilities. Whereas work was serious, play was supposed to be fun and re-creative - and trifling or trivial as opposed to being earnest and weighty.

It was while studying philosophy of education at Yale with John S. Brubacher in the mid-1940s that he called to my attention the many limitations inherent in the typical usage of the two terms by laymen and educators alike. This led to preliminary analysis which indicated that some people "worked at play," whereas certain others "played at

SP010 543

* A paper presented at the Sixth Annual Meeting of the Philosophic Society for the Study of Sport, Hartford, Connecticut, October 21-23, 1976.

their work." Further, it became apparent that there was considerable educational value - however that might be defined - in many structured or semi-structured activities that were typically designated as play. And so, for the first time, I became aware of what has been designated as a scientific (Deweyan) ethical analysis technique - with the remainder of the triumvirate being called an authoritarian approach or a relativistic technique. As explained by Fromm,

> The most significant contemporary proponent of a scientific ethics is John Dewey, whose views are opposed both to authoritarianism and to relativism in ethics. As to the former, he states that the common feature of appeal to revelation, divinely ordained rulers, commands of the state, convention, tradition, and so on, 'is that there is some voice so authoritative as to preclude the need of inquiry' (J. Dewey and J. H. Tufts, Ethics. N.Y.: H. Holt & Co. Rev. ed., 1932, p. 364). As to the latter, he holds that the fact that something is enjoyed is not in itself 'a judgment of the value of what is enjoyed' (Dewey, Problems of Men. N.Y.: H. Holt & Co., 1946, p. 254). The enjoyment is a basic datum, but it has to be 'verified by evidential facts' (Ibid., p. 260).
> (Fromm, 1967, p. 37)

But even though I had evidently understood the possible educational implications of play based on pragmatic theory, I recall myself writing for Ontario's developing recreation profession in the 1950s that "play" was for children! This was followed by a statement that "recreation" was for mature adults. Looking back upon that "profound" statement some twenty-five years later, I can't comprehend why no one present challenged such pedantic dictum. Can't you just imagine telling people today that adults should never play - just recreate!

Then in the 1960s James Keating offered us his distinction between the concepts of 'sport' and 'athletics.' When you analyzed this idea - which was basically sound albeit highly impractical in a world where the public often ignores etymological distinctions - it turned out that the terms or concepts may be likened fundamentally to 'play' and 'work'

respectively. Thus, however rational Keating's distinction may have been (Keating, 1963, pp. 149, 201-210), the words "sport" and "athletics"are currently being used interchangeably on the North American continent, although in England and on the European continent - and perhaps in the rest of the world - there seems to be an identification of the word "athletics" more directly with track and field events only.

However, the concepts of 'work' and 'play' are still strongly dichotomized just about everywhere. There seems to be no trend whatsoever toward clarifying that which is obviously imprecise and actually muddled in typical usage, even though many educators holding various educational philosophical stances would affirm that "play" under certain "educational" conditions contributes to a child's educational experience and growth. And nowhere is the confusion more evident than when we are discussing to what extent the nomenclature of "work" and "play" may be applied when referring to various levels of participation in sport and/or athletics on the North American scene.

To repeat, therefore, the <u>main problem</u> of this paper is to analyze critically (or metaethically) the concepts of 'work' and 'play' as they are currently employed in North America, and to relate such distinctions to sport and/or athletics as we know them typically in society at large or within the educational setting specifically. The following <u>sub-problems</u> of the topic, phrased as questions, will be discussed in this order: (1) how may some of the fundamental terms being employed be defined initially? (2) what is the status of sport and/or athletics in North America? (3) does such status have a possible

relationship to the prevailing social forces at work in North America? (4) would altered concepts of 'work' and 'play' - in a democratic culture where individual freedom is valued highly - possibly exert an influence on the prevailing pattern in sport/athletics? and (5) how may this question be summarized and what reasonable conclusion(s) may be drawn from this analysis?

Definition of Terms

Work. The term "work" can be used as a noun in a number of different ways (e.g., "something that is or was done"; "something to do or be done"; "a person's action of a particular kind"; "an action involving effort or exertion directed to a definite end" - i.e., "one's regular occupation or employment"; "a particular piece or act of labour; a task, job"; and "exercise or practice in a sport or game; also, exertion or movement proper to a particular sport, game, or exercise" (The Oxford Universal Dictionary, 1955, p. 2449). Used in a second sense as a noun, the term "work" is "the product of the operation or labour of a person or other agent" (Ibid.).

The term "work" is used also as both a transitive and intransitive verb and, of course, such usage has a close relationship to its use as a noun. Some twenty different usages are listed for its employment as a transitive verb (e.g., "to do a deed"; "to effect something or some action"; "to move something into position," etc.). The intransitive verb is used in approximately fourteen ways, some of which have direct application to our purposes here (e.g., "to do something or to do things generally"; "to pursue a regular occupation"; "to perform the work proper or incidental to one's business or avocation" (Ibid., p. 2449).

Synonyms for the word "work" are achievement, business, drudgery, effort, employment, labor, occupation, opus, performance, production, task, toil, and travail. Antonyms for "work" are ease, leisure, play, recreation, vacation (The Living Webster Encyclopedic Dictionary of the English Language, 1975, p. BT-34).

Play. The term "play" can be used as a noun in many ways (e.g., "exercise, free movement or action"; "exercise or action by way of recreation, amusement, or sport"; and "mimic action" (The Oxford Universal Dictionary, 1955, p. 1920).

The term "play" is used as a verb in five general ways, and such usage - as was the case with the term "work" - has a close relationship to its use as a noun. These usages are as follows: (1) "to exercise oneself, act or move energetically"; (2) "to exercise oneself in the way of diversion or amusement"; (3) "to engage in a game, etc."; (4) "to perform instrumental music"; and (5) "to perform dramatically, etc." (Ibid., p. 1521).

Synonyms for the word "play" used as a noun are listed under the word "recreation." They are as follows: amusement, diversion, entertainment, fun, game, pastime, and sport. Antonyms for "play" are boredom, labor, toil, and work (listed also under "recreation") (The Living Webster Encyclopedic Dictionary of the English Language, 1975, p. BT-26).

Freedom. The term "freedom" is used here to describe the "condition of being able to choose and to carry out purposes" (Muller, 1961, xiii). Or to be more precise, keeping in mind that the traditional, liberal meaning of freedom relates to the absence of constraint or coercion, the following definition appears to describe the term more

adequately:

> A man is said to be free to the extent that he can choose his own goals or course of conduct, can choose between alternatives available to him, and is not compelled to act as he himself would not choose to act, or prevented from acting as he would otherwise choose to act, by the will of another man, of the state, or of any other authority (Partridge, 1967, Vol. 3, p. 222).

Synonyms for the word "freedom" are exemption, familiarity, immunity, independence, liberation, liberty, ridiculous, senseless, silly, and simple. Antonyms are bondage, compulsion, constraint, necessity, and servitude (The Living Webster, etc., p. BT-14).

Amateur. An amateur is "one who cultivates any art or pursuit for the enjoyment of it, instead of professionally or for gain, sometimes implying desultory action or crude results; a devotee" (The Living Webster, etc., p. 32).

Synonyms for the term "amateur" are apprentice, beginner, dabbler, dilettante, learner, neophyte, and novice. Antonyms are adept, authority, expert, master, and professional (Ibid., p. BT-2).

Semipro. A semipro (Colloq., a semiprofessional) is one who engages in some sport or other activity for pay but only as a part-time occupation (Ibid., p. 876). The person resembles a professional, but his/her performance demands less skill, knowledge, and the like.

Professional. A professional is a member of any profession, but more often applied, in opposition to amateur, to persons who make their living by arts or sports in which others engage as a pastime (Ibid., p. 761).

Sport. A sport is a "diversion, amusement, or recreation; a pleasant pastime; a pastime pursued in the open air or having an athletic character, as hunting, fishing, baseball, bowling, or wrestling,

etc. (Ibid., p. 942). Further meanings are listed which are not applicable to the present discussion.

Synonyms for the term "sport" are listed under "games" as amusement, contest, diversion, fun, match, merriment, pastime, play, and recreation. Antonyms mentioned are business, drudgery, hardship, labor, and work (Ibid., pp. BT 14 and 15).

Athletics. Athletics is a plural noun that is acceptable in usage as either singular or plural in construction. It (they) may be described as "athletic exercises: sports such as tennis, rowing, boxing, etc. (Ibid., p. 63). (Note that track and field are not mentioned as typical or prototype examples, although they are undoubtedly considered part of the sports included under the term "athletics" in North America.)

In a preliminary, inspectional way, therefore, it is possible to construct a diagram based on the more or less traditional definitions of the terms "play," "work," "freedom," "constraint," "sport," "athletics," "amateur," and "professional." With each pair of terms there is a sharp dichotomization in normal usage except with the terms "sport" and "athletics." Nevertheless, in this diagram they are shown as being dichotomized because of Keating's recommendation. Despite what has just been said, and which is diagrammed in Figure #1 below, subsequent consideration of a more careful nature gives rise to the idea that the concepts of 'play' and 'work' could truly be placed on a continuum as opposed to a discontinuum as shown at the top of the figure. In this instance the continuum would extend from 'frivolity'on the left through 'play' to the concept of 'work' and finally to 'drudgery' on the far right.

(Figure #1)

A PLAY-WORK DEFINITIONAL DIAGRAM
RELATING TO THE CONCEPTS OF
'SPORT','FREEDOM', AND 'AMATEURISM'

Note: A sharp dichotomization is typically implied when the concepts are considered initially and typically employed in common parlance. Even the dictionary definitions - including both synonyms and antonyms - appear as a discontinuum.

Play ----------(as typically used)---------- Work

Freedom ----------(as typically used)---------- Constraint

Amateur ----------(as typically used)---------- Professional

Sport ----------(Keating's etymological analysis stresses dichotomization, but the two terms are typically used synomously in this culture.)---------- Athletics

Note: The terms "play" and "work," along with "frivolity" and "drudgery," are placed on a continuum below - as opposed to the discontinuum shown above.

Presumably the same approach could be employed with the other terms indicated as the several continua are extended to their extremities. As J. S. Brubacher indicates in correspondence dated September 27, 1976, "work and play tend to overlap toward the middle of the continuum when work can be pleasant and play can be toilsome . . . Similarly, at the drudgery end, it is all constraint, and at the frivolity end of the continuum end the freedom becomes license."

A Continuum Approach

Frivolity ---------- Play ---------- Work ---------- Drudgery

E. F. Zeigler
1976

The Status of Sport/Athletics

The comments made, and the opinions offered, about the status of amateur, semiprofessional, and professional sport are based upon a half century of personal experience and observation as a performer, as a coach of performers, as a teacher of coaches, as a professor writing about the professional preparation of coaches, and as a person writing about sport within society from a disciplinary standpoint. After my first ten years of coaching experience in three different sports in two major universities in the United States and Canada and in a Y.M.C.A., I began to write about sport in a normative, hortatory, and common sense fashion. This type of article was superseded to a large extent in the 1960s by an effort to draw implications from the various educational philosophical stances extant at the time. However, realizing the uncertainty and imprecision of normative ethics and ethical relativism, I maintained a continuous flow of material down to the present time in which I have espoused what might be called a Deweyan scientific ethic based upon a merging of the historic value-facts controversy (Zeigler, 1960, 1962, 1964, 1965, 1968, 1969, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1974, 1975, etc.). More recently I have been following a more eclectic philosophical methodology involving several techniques, including metaethical or critical analysis of sport and physical activity - hence this present effort to delineate somewhat more carefully problems that arise typically in the use of such terms as "work," "play," "freedom," "constraint," "sport," "athletics," "amateur," "semi-pro," and "professional" when discussing sport and its myriad problems and contentious issues.

Writing in 1967 (Zeigler, pp. 47-49), for purposes of discussion

about "leading a good life," I noted that:

> it is not necessary to delineate the various meanings of play too carefully; so, we will accept the definition that play is an instinctive form of self-expression through pleasurable activity which seems to be aimless in nature . . .

In discussing work at the same time, it was pointed out that:

> Many people are now choosing leisure instead of more work, because they wanted to "enjoy life."

Speaking at the Athletics in America Symposium at Oregon State University in 1971, the point was made that "North Americans must ponder the term 'freedom' deeply today as they face an uncertain future. Here freedom is defined as 'the condition of being able to choose and carry out purposes" (p. 79). Subsequently the statement was made that "the field of athletics and sport seems to be at least as poorly prepared as any in the educational system to help young people to get ready for the future."

For many years also I have been attempting the "philosophical analysis" of one of the most persistent problems facing higher education - that of so-called amateur, semiprofessional, and professional sport and its relationship to our educational system, as well as our entire culture (in Flath, 1964). I have argued the necessity for re-evaluation of our treasured, basic assumptions about the amateur code in sport. Further, I have decried the materialistic image of today's professional in sport, the argument being that he is being professional only in the limited sense of the word - that it brought money to him quickly for athletic performance at a high level, without his commitment as a true professional whose primary aim in life is to serve his fellow-man through his varied contributions to his own sport in particular and to all sport in general. Thus, I have argued

that the amateur should be regarded as the beginner - not as the Olympic performer who somehow refrained from taking cash but who received all kinds of invaluable support along the way. I have presented the idea of a logical, bonafide, and desirable progression - if the person wished to progress and was capable - through the ranks of the amateur athlete to that of the semipro, and finally to that of the highly trained, proficient athletic performer - a professional!

I would not wish to create the impression that this has been a solitary effort - far from it. As far back as 1929, the Carnegie Report entitled American College Athletics explained that "the defects of American college athletics are two: commercialism, and a negligent attitude toward the educational opportunity for which the American college exists." Additionally, the Report stressed that the prevailing amateur code was violated continually; that recruiting and subsidizing was "the darkest blot upon American college sport"; that athletic training and hygiene practices were deplorable and actually jeopardized health in many instances; that athletes are not poorer academically, but that hard training for long hours impaired scholastic standing; that athletics as conducted fail in many cases "to utilize and strengthen such desirable social traits as honesty and the sense of fair play"; that few of the sports which are most popular contributed to physical recreation after college; that many head coaches were receiving higher pay than full professors, but that their positions were dependent upon successful win-loss records; that the athletic conferences were not abiding by the letter, much less the spirit of the established rules and regulations; and that athletes were not receiving the opportunity to "mature under responsibility."

In 1974, some forty-five years later, there seems to be every indication that the only one of the above-mentioned areas of criticism showing improvement would be that of athletic training and hygiene practices! Even on this point a cynic would be quick to point out that improved athletic training could be expected because of the desire to keep expensive athletic talent healthy enough to "earn its keep." At any rate, in the year 1974 the American Council on Education was perceptive enough to discover that "there's a moral problem in college athletics," and that "the pressure to win is enormous" (Cady, The New York Times, March 10, 1974) - facts which have been known to cognoscenti in educational circles for decades. For example, The New York Times commissioned a survey of some forty colleges and universities and reported in 1951 that the flagrant abuse of athletic subsidization in many colleges and universities "promoted the establishment of false values"; "are the bane of existence in American education"; "lower educational standards generally"; force educators "to lose out to politicians"; and "do further injury to democracy in education" (Grutzner, 1951). Obviously, it serves no good purpose to enumerate such statements endlessly, because volumes could be filled with them before 1929 and up to the present.

Even though this paper is not designed so that it will prove logically that the status of athletics or sport in United States' education is unsound according to the so-called educational standards or principles upon which most colleges and universities are based, it is essential to justify the conclusion that many colleges and universities are conducting intercollegiate athletics in such a manner that many questions have been raised over the years about their educational value - and the situation seems to be as bad today as it ever was!

This is the reason for inclusion of the section on the status of such programs. It is important to keep in mind further that not all colleges and universities are conducting their intercollegiate athletic programs so as to warrant such severe criticism. One has to go no further than the Little Three in New England, most Ivy League institutions, a large university like Wayne State in Detroit, and the University of Illinois at Chicago Circle, to name just a few. Further, Canada has been most fortunate in the realm of university competitive sport, and the prevailing "amateur spirit" there has definitely influenced the secondary school outlook as well. This is not to say that there aren't warning signs on the horizon, but a recent survey carried out by the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada reported that intercollegiate athletics has been able to maintain what was called its amateur spirit and educational balance, generally speaking. As reported by Matthews,

> Canadian universities appear to be in a position to strive for a very high level of athletic and recreational development in international comparison. University athletic programs must be seen as a need of the people - of individuals, of groups, and of the entire university community . . .
> (Matthews, 1974, p. 3)

Relationship of Status to Prevailing Social Forces

Keeping in mind that our objective is to analyze the concepts of 'work' and 'play' as currently employed, and to relate such distinctions to sport and athletics in a more precise way, it is important to reiterate at this point (see pp. 4 and 5 above) that both terms ("work" and "play") may be used correctly in a number of ways. Such correct usage ranges from "something that is done" to "exercise or practice in a sport or game" for the concept of 'work.' Similarly the term "play" ranges all the way from "exercise or action by way of

recreation, amusement, or sport" to so-called "mimic action" in a dramatic performance in the theater. Highly important, therefore, and crucial to the argument being presented here, is the fact that in each case these terms ("work" and "play") have assumed so-called typical meanings in the language and thought of people - "effort" or "labor," for example, for "work," and "amusement" or "fun" for the term "play." Furthermore, it is argued that the sharp dichotomization of these two concepts in everyday usage, when they actually have almost identical, strongly overlapping meanings in a dictionary, has often caused confusion when sport and athletics were being considered as part of the cultural configuration of North American society.

It seems to be impossible to state precisely why such a sharp dichotomization of the two concepts of 'work' and 'play' have persisted in everyday usage, but such a distinction undoubtedly has some relationship to the influence of the pivotal social forces on our culture(e.g., values, type of political state, nationalism, economics, religion, and now ecology). It was obvious to people in earlier centuries that work had a so-called survival value - and presumably much more of this quality than play. Indeed it took so very long for the average man on this continent to earn and use leisure. There have been so many wars, and nothing is more devastating to an economy. We can't escape the fact that a surplus economy is absolutely necessary if people are to have a high standard of education and leisure (Brubacher, 1966, p. 76 et ff.). Secondly, the truism that times change slowly must be mentioned. It is extremely difficult to change the traditions and mores of a civilization. The existing political system continued to prevail, and it took a revolution, a civil war, and other

conflicts of varying magnitude before the concept of 'political democracy' had an opportunity to grow (Zeigler, 1975, p. 457).

Thirdly, the power of the church - almost absolute at times - had to be weakened before the concept of 'church and state separation' could become a reality - and all of us appreciate the several basic reasons why the church affirmed the concept of 'work' and accordingly denigrated the concept of 'play,' or those of 'leisure' and 'recreation.' Fourthly, the many implications of the natural sciences had to be consolidated into very real gains before advanced technology could be realized and could lead men into an industrial revolution, the outcomes of which we possibly still cannot foresee, and which - on this continent at least - have lowered many men's working hours down to the point where the idea of play and leisure could loom more importantly in his purview than heretofore.

Consequently, one could argue that the prevailing social forces have most definitely influenced the status of sport and athletics (if defined identically or even similarly). If the United States, for example, can become "Number #1" in the world through a unique, but probably not reproducible, set of circumstances in which the concept of 'work' was exalted by all of the pivotal social forces - and the idea of 'play' was viewed typically as "<u>frivolous</u> refreshment from <u>worthwhile</u> toil and labor" - it is not difficult to understand why such a sharp dichotomy developed between these two terms. Accordingly, it is only a short step to the position that playing games or sports is really not very important, is extra-curricular, and must come after effort has resulted in achievment at any rate. This would seem to be the rationale, therefore, for the sharp dichotomization - and differen-

tiation in value - of the two terms in everyday usage.

Possible Relationship of Altered Concepts to Sport

What we are perceiving here, of course, is a relationship or "proposition seemingly self-contradictory or absurd, and yet explicable as expressing a truth" - in other words, a paradox. A paradox is typically incredible, and (as Brubacher explains) we have created a situation in which our language - or choice of words - actually downgrades that which we seem to be seeking in the so-called good life:

> The oldest and perhaps most persistent position regards work or labor principally as the means whereby leisure used in our culture as a word synomous with recreation and play is purchased to devote to education. Stated succinctly, the good life depends on labor but consists in leisure (Brubacher, 1969, p. 34).

The assumption here is that leisure (play) is actually superior to labor (work) in this culture. People must work in order to stay alive or live, but they have completely free rein when it comes to the use of their leisure. Leisure (play) is worthwhile on its own account! Further, any educational theory which does not encourage wise use of leisure for so-called educational purposes might soon run into difficulty. But if the student, for example, felt an obligation to pursue education diligently, we are then back to the position where education could be regarded as work again! Interestingly enough, what all of this leads to is a position where work becomes subservient to leisure, and this is just fine for an aristocratic society: one social class works so that another class can be free to enjoy leisure. If this situation is reversed and the place of work dominates educational policy, we have a Marxian type of society in which economic theory looms very large in the educational system. Presumably in between

these two extremes would be the position in this regard of the evolving democratic society - one in which work is a continuing opportunity for man to follow an evolutionary pattern onward and "upward" (whatever that may mean). "Work finds its educational significance in its humanization of man," and a "child's active occupation" in school is not regarded as tedious, laborious schoolwork. Work, play, and art all relate to the "active occupation" of the boy or girl, and no significant difference can be made as to the educational significance of any of the three aspects. Art, for example, is "work permeated with the play attitude" (p. 36).

Such a theoretical approach contradicts the dualistic or dichotomous theory of work and play upon which we have been focusing. Now they are viewed as possessing overlapping and not separate entities or categories. Thus - and isn't this the way it really happens - some people take their play very seriously, while others seem to play at being professional in their work. In fact, it all becomes most confusing when an effort is made to analyze the situation as to where play leaves off and becomes work (and vice versa). All of which has led me to conceive of a "play-work definitional continuum" in quite different terms than was explained above (see Fig. #1, p. 7).

This newer conception has been called "aspects of a person's 'active occupation'" (see Figure #2 below) - a situation in which so-called work, play, and art have epistemological and ethical significance in the realization of the person's humanity in a social environment. First, on Level I, we have the person - conceived as a "unified organism" - with his/her educational and/or recreational interests of varying nature that will presumably be present throughout the individual's life. Second, on Level II, is the so-called goals

(Figure #2)

ASPECTS OF A PERSON'S "ACTIVE OCCUPATION"

(1. Play ------ 2. Art ---------- 3. Work)

Freedom-Constraint Continuum

Level IV

Freedom ---------- Limited Freedom ---------- Constraint (No Freedom)

Amateur-Professional Continuum

Level III

Amateur ---------- Semipro ---------- Professional

Goals Continuum

Level II

Short Range -------- Middle Range ---------- Long Range

Categories of Interest

Level I

The Unified Organism

1. Physical education-recreation interests
2. Social education-recreation interests
3. "Learning" education-recreation interests
4. Aesthetic education-recreation interests
5. Communicative education-recreation interests

continuum of short range, middle range, and long range goals. It is at this point that such a differentiation in approach is being recommended from the prevailing sharply dichotomized definitions of the terms "work" and "play." Presumably - and it is not being proposed that it is possible or desirable to reverse people's language habits markedly in any direction - an effort could be made to use the term "work" for <u>educational</u> purposes primarily when the purposes or goals are middle or long range in nature, and to use the term "play" when the goals are short to middle range. Thus, if a boy plays baseball after school, his goals are short range and therefore conceived as 'play.' If this boy continues with his interest in high school and college, and were to receive an athletic scholarship, play would quite often take on the aspect of work. Further, at this point he could then be considered a semipro, and this would be so because of the time being spent, the middle range goals attendant to his athletic activity, and the level of ability or performance he had achieved - <u>as well as</u> the fact that he was being paid a certain amount of money for performing the baseball skills he had mastered. Such consideration brings us to the third subdivision of Figure #2, Level III. Now if this young man were to be selected in the draft by the major leagues, he would then be forced to make a decision on Level II, the Goals Continuum. If he did well in his try-outs and were granted a substantive contract, baseball would then be related to this person's long range goals, and he would be considered a professional in sport.

This brings us to a brief consideration of Level IV, the Freedom-Constraint Continuum. Gradually, but steadily as this young man moves up through the various stages of organized baseball, the status of

his freedom or independence changes. This is true in most people's regular lives in a social environment as well, but such an alteration is particularly true in this instance where the relationship between a young man and organized baseball is being discussed. Of course, many other similar examples come to mind relative to all phases of people's lives.

Altering these concepts of 'work' and 'play' - not to mention those of 'amateur' and 'professional' - would in my opinion have a positive influence on the prevailing pattern in North American sport and athletics. For more than thirty years I have been speaking and writing to help to bring about a change in the United States Amateur Athletic Union rules for those who participate locally, state-wide, regionally, nationally, and internationally under their auspices. This organization had a noble ideal once in the late 1800s, but changing times and increasing role differentiation in society has brought us to the point today where the situation is absolutely ridiculous! Writing in 1964, in an effort to urge others to distinguish more carefully between the ways that we used the various terms being considered, I stated:

> We will have to re-evaluate some of our treasured, basic assumptions about the amateur code in sport. What <u>are</u> the reasons <u>today</u> for the continuation of such a sharp distinction between the amateur and the professional? History tells us where the ideal originated, but it tells us also that the conditions which brought it about do not exist in America today . . . And what is so wrong with a young sportsman being classified as a semiprofessional? Do we brand the musician, the artist, or the actor in our society who develops his talent sufficiently to receive some remuneration for his efforts as being a "dirty pro"? Why must this idea persist in sport - a legitimate phase of our culture? . . . We cannot agree either with the cynic who says that there are no more amateurs in sport. This is not true. There are, and ever will be, amateurs in the only logical sense of the words today.

> The amateur is the beginner, the dabbler, the dilettante . . .
> (Zeigler, in Flath, 1964, Introd. Chapter)

In my opinion, therefore, careful consideration of this matter, including conceptual analysis of the ordinary language employed, could well have a significant influence of a positive nature on the prevailing pattern in North American sport and athletics today.

Summary and Conclusions

To summarize, then, after introducing the topic and placing it in philosophical perspective in regard to the major approaches to ethical analysis extant, the main problem of the paper was indicated as a metaethical or critical analysis of the concepts of 'work' and 'play' as currently employed in North America. The second phase of the main problem was to relate the various definitions of the terms reviewed to sport and athletics as we know them typically in society at large and within the educational setting specifically.

The following sub-problems were analyzed in sequence to serve as data to assist with the analysis of the main problem:

1. Definitions of the following words, along with appropriate synonyms and antonyms, were enumerated: work, play, freedom, amateur, semipro, professional, sport, and athletics.

   These terms were placed in a "traditional" play-work definitional diagram as applied to sport and athletics.

2. The status, along with some brief historical data of sport/athletics in the United States and Canada was reviewed (with particular emphasis on the college and university level).

3. The possible relationship between the prevailing, pivotal social forces and the status of sport was discussed. It was explained why the terms "work" and "play" had become so sharply dichotomized.

4. Prior to the recommendation of altered concepts of work and play as being more appropriate for an evolving democratic society, the relationship of these concepts within communism and aristocracy was described. A model entitled "Aspects of a Person's 'Active Occupation'" was

constructed with play, art, and work (Dewey) included as the three appropriate aspects. These terms were related from the standpoint of the "unified organism" and that person's varied educational-recreational interests (Level I) to the Goals Continuum (Level II), the Amateur-Professional Continuum (Level III), and the Freedom-Constraint Continuum (Level IV).

Finally, it was pointed out that modifying these various concepts - notably "work," "play," "amateur," and "Professional" would in all probability have a positive influence on the prevailing pattern in North American sport and athletics.

One final conclusion seems justifiable if this argument has merit: the concepts of "work" and "play" should be modified - especially in the educational setting - so that a continuum between them and the concept of 'art' is recognized rather than the sharp dichotomization that exists currently. A similar spectrum should be applied to the terms "amateur" and "professional" with the term "semipro" in the middle. Such changes would in all probability exert a positive influence and help to clarify the "language ailment" that afflicts sport and athletics in North America. Once the "disease" is identified, treatment and prognosis may be possible. The time to apply such a remedy is long overdue.

GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baker, Russell, "Good Bad Sports," The New York Times, February 1, 1976.

Bloy, Myron B., Jr., "Second Edition/The Christian Norm," The Center Magazine, Vol. 8 (1975), No. 6: 71-74.

Brandt, Richard B. Ethical Theory. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959.

Brubacher, John S. A History of the Problems of Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966.

_____. Modern Philosophies of Education, 4th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1969.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, The. American College Athletics (Howard J. Savage et al., eds.). New York: The Foundation, Bulletin #23, 1929.

Dewey, John. Problems of Men. New York: H. Holt & Co., 1946.

_____, and Tufts, J. H. Ethics. New York: H. Holt & Co., Rev. ed., 1932.

Frankena, William K. Ethics. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963.

Fromm, Erich. Man for Himself. New York: Fawcett World Library, 1967. (Published originally by Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., in 1947).

Grutzner, Charles. "The Impact of Athletics on Education." Wash., D.C.: Babe Ruth Sportsmanship Awards Committee, 1951. (Reprinted as pamphlet with permission of The New York Times).

Harrison, Geoffrey, "Relativism and Tolerance," Ethics, Vol. 86 (January 1976), No. 2: 122-135.

Henry, Jules. Culture Against Man. New York: Random House, 1963.

Keating, James W., "Winning in Sport and Athletics," Thought (Fordham University Quarterly), Vol. XXXVIII, No. 149: 201-210 (Summer 1963).

Ladd, John (ed.). Ethical Relativism. Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1973.

Ladenson, Robert F., "A Theory of Personal Autonomy," Ethics, Vol. 86 (October 1975), No. 1: 30-48.

Living Webster Encyclopedic Dictionary of the English Language, The Chicago, Ill.: The English Language Institute of America, 1975.

Lyons, David, "Ethical Relativism and the Problem of Incoherence," Ethics, Vol. 86 (January 1976), No. 2: 107-121.

Maeroff, Gene I., "West Point Cheaters Have a Lot of Company," The New York Times, June 20, 1976.

Martens, Rainer, "Kid Sports: A Den of Iniquity or Land of Promise." An address given at the National College Physical Education Association for Men, Hot Springs, Arkansas, Jan. 8-11, 1976.

Matthews, A. W. Athletics in Canadian Universities. Ottawa: Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, 1974.

McDermott, John J. (ed.). The Philosophy of John Dewey (Volume II - The Lived Experience). New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1973.

Muller, Herbert J. Freedom in the Ancient World. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1961.

Oxford Universal Dictionary, The (C. T. Onions, ed.). London: Oxford University Press, Third edition, 1955.

Partridge, P. H., "Freedom," in Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Paul Edwards, ed.). New York: The Macmillan Company and The Free Press, 1967, Vol. 3, pp. 221-225.

Richardson, Deane E., "Ethical Conduct in Sport Situations," in Proceedings of the 66th Annual Meeting of the National College Physical Education Association for Men, 1963, pp. 98-104.

Sahakian, William S. Ethics: An Introduction to Theories and Problems. New York: Barnes & Noble Books, 1974.

Salmon, Wesley C. Logic. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963.

Taylor, Paul W. Problems of Moral Philosophy. Belmont, Calif.: Dickenson Publishing Company, Inc., 1967.

Zeigler, Earle F., "A True Professional Needs a Consistent Philosophy," Australian Journal of Physical Education, No. 18: 15-16 (Feb.-March 1960).

_____, "Naturalism in Physical, Health, and Recreation Education," The University of Michigan School of Education Bulletin, Vol. 34, No. 2: 42-46 (December 1962).

_____, "A Philosophical Analysis of Amateurism in Competitive Athletics," School Activities, Vol. XXXV, No. 7: 199-203 (March 1964).

_____, "A Philosophical Analysis of Recreation and Leisure," Quest, Monograph V: 8-17 (December 1965).

_____, "A Riddle for Tomorrow's World: How to Lead a Good Life," Parks & Recreation, Vol. 11, No. 9: 28, 47-49 (September 1967).

_____, Problems in the History and Philosophy of Physical Education and Sport. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968.

_____, "Vigorous Physical Education and Sport as Essential Ingredients in America's Pattern of Physical Education," The Physical Educator, Vol. 26, No. L: 14-17 (March 1969)

_____, "The Rationale for Philosophical Analysis with Implications for Physical Education and Sport," Illinois Journal of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, 1: 17-18 (Winter 1970).

_____, "A Comparative Analysis of Educational Values in Selected Countries: Their Implications for Sport and Physical Education," in Proceedings of the National College Physical Education Association for Men, Minneapolis, Minn., 1971, pp. 169-174.

_____, "The Black Athlete's Non-Athletic Problems," Educational Theory, Vol. 22, No. 4: 421-426 (1972).

_____, "The Pragmatic (Experimentalistic) Ethic as It Relates to Sport and Physical Education." A paper presented at the 2nd Annual Meeting of the Philosophic Society for the Study of Sport, SUNY, College at Brockport, New York, October 26-28, 1972.

_____, "Putting the Greek Ideal in Perspective in North American Athletics Today," in Athletics in America (A. W. Flath, ed.). Corvallis, Oregon: Oregon State University Bookstore, 1972.

_____, "Intramurals: Profession, Discipline, or Part Thereof? in Proceedings of the National College Physical Education Association for Men, Minneapolis, Minn., 1973, pp. 85-90.

_____, "Freedom in Competitive Sport," A paper presented at the 4th Annual Meeting of the Philosophic Society for the Study of Sport, The Univ. of Western Ontario, London, Canada, November 16, 1974. (Published subsequently in Zeigler's 1975 book listed below).

_____, Personalizing Physical Education and Sport Philosophy. Champaign, Ill.: Stipes Publishing Company, 1975.

ADDENDUM

Flath, Arnold W. A History of the Relations between the N.C.A.A. and the A.A.U. Champaign, Ill.: Stipes Publishing Company, 1964.